



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/747,909	12/22/2000	Lucy Broyles	4013-00100	4442

30652 7590 03/07/2005

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 GRANITE PARKWAY, SUITE 330
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

CARTER, MONICA SMITH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3722

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/747,909

Applicant(s)

BROYLES, LUCY

Examiner

Monica S. Carter

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 and 23-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-20 and 23-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The request filed on February 11, 2005 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/747,909 is acceptable and an RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 24 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, "sides" should be replaced with "sites". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 26, 27, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 26 and 36, it is not clear what is meant by "the pre-reader play-reads."

In claims 27 and 37, it is not clear what is meant by "physically separated."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3722

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 17, 23-27 and 31-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seaton (2,694,264) in view of Gunter et al. (5,387,107).

Seaton discloses a process by which a reader facilitates the reading skills of a pre-reader (see column 1, lines 19-22) comprising the reader obtaining a repetitive language kit (10) having a theme ("illustrations of animals, houses, people, etc." – column 2, lines 1-4), the repetitive language kit comprising a plurality of pages (13) having binder and outer edges (as seen in figure 3), the plurality of pages including pages having indicia ("illustrations of animals, houses, people, etc." – column 2, lines 1-4); a binder (14) configured to secure the plurality of pages proximate the binder edges (as seen in figure 3); a photographic site configured to receive a pictorial representation (as seen in figure 3); a caption site (16) corresponding to the photographic site, the caption site configured to receive text (see column 2, lines 4-6); the reader sharing an experience (the parent reads the text while the child listens – see column 2, lines 9-11); and memorializing the shared story between the reader and the pre-reader through pictorial representations (as seen in figure 3).

Seaton discloses the claimed invention except for personalizing the repetitive language kit by affixing pictorial representations to corresponding photographic sites and adding text to the caption sites in an organized preferred order.

Gunter et al. disclose a storybook for teaching desired behavioral patterns having front and back covers and a plurality of pages therebetween. The covers and pages are

Art Unit: 3722

bound together in a conventional manner. The pages have text printed thereon accompanied by an illustration relating to the theme of the storybook. The illustration may be personalized with the likeness of the reader by applying a photograph of the reader to the pages via adhesive or a transparent pocket (as seen in figures 5 and 6). The pages may be provided with an illustrative environment in which the personalized character interacts. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the book of Seaton with illustrations that may be affixed to the pages of the book, as taught by Gunter et al., to encourage enthusiasm from the pre-reader and to inspire the pre-reader to want to learn to read the book.

The kit having a theme related to a planned shared experience between the reader and the pre-reader sets forth the intended use of the kit. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Regarding claims 17, 23, 24, 31, 32, 34, 36 and 37, Seaton, as modified by Gunter et al., discloses the claimed invention except for the specific arrangement and/or content of indicia (repetitive text related to the theme of the planned shared experience between the reader and the pre-reader) set forth in the claim(s). It would have been

Art Unit: 3722

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide any desired text on the pages, since it would only depend on the intended use of the assembly and the desired information to be displayed. Further, it has been held that when the claimed printed matter is not functionally related to the substrate it will not distinguish the invention from the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Gulack*, 217 USPQ 401, (CAFC 1983). The fact that the content of the printed matter placed on the substrate may render the device more convenient by providing an individual with a specific type of text does not alter the functional relationship. Mere support by the substrate for the printed matter is not the kind of functional relationship necessary for patentability. Thus, there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter and the substrate which is required for patentability.

Regarding claims 25, 26, 35 and 36, Seaton, as modified by Gunter et al., discloses the claimed invention except for constructing a second personalized repetitive language book. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide any number of books to be read by the reader and the pre-reader, since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Regarding claims 27 and 37, it is inherent that the reader and the pre-reader would be physically separated, since they comprise two different people.

Regarding claim 33, see the above rejections to claim 17.

Art Unit: 3722

7. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seaton in view of Gunter et al. and further in view of Illos et al. ('738).

Seaton, as modified by Gunter et al., disclose the claimed invention except for the binder being selected from the group consisting of lace, ribbon, string and yarn, the binder being threaded through perforations of the front cover, back cover, and plurality of pages to form a plurality of loops proximate the front cover perforations and the ends being threaded through the loops for securing together.

Illos et al. disclose a tamper-proof page assembly comprising a plurality of pages (10) having a ribbon binder (16) for securing the pages together. Illos et al. show that ribbon is an equivalent structure for binding pages known in the art. Therefore, because these two binding structures were ad-recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute ribbon, as taught by Illos et al., for the binding of Seaton.

8. Claims 28-30, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seaton in view of Gunter et al. and further in view of Phillips (5,651,678).

Seaton, as modified by Gunter et al., discloses the claimed invention except for explicitly disclosing the process of memorizing the text on the pages.

Phillips discloses an educational aid and method for using it to teach students to read by facilitating the rapid development of sight-word vocabularies in an interesting and challenging manner through the utilization of a student's natural ability to learn and

memorize a text (see column 2, lines 39-42, 66-67 thorough column 3, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of education to memorize text on pages, as taught by Phillips, to facilitate the instruction of students to read.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-20 and 23-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited references disclose method of teaching a child to read and memorize text.


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monica S. Carter whose telephone number is (571) 272-4475. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (6:00 AM - 3:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on (571) 272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 4, 2005


MONICA S. CARTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER